

Church, Durham, where they exist in a perfect state; and of St. Peter's, Northampton, where the remaining portions clearly indicated (at the time of my visit, a few years since) their original use. The nave of St. Peter's Church, I am inclined to think, had its roof supported by a series of such gables, above the alternate piers.

The Church of San Miniato, without the walls of Florence, has precisely this arrangement, except that the gable occurs over every third pier only; but, in other respects, the quatrefoil plan of the pier, and the appropriation of two of the group of shafts to the support of the nave arches (one at the back for the gable across the aisle, and the fourth in the front, which is carried up on the face of the clerestory for supporting the arch and gable over the nave), are identical in the two churches.

Speaking of San Miniato, Mr. Galley Knight observes:—"Large arches are thrown at intervals over the nave, connected with smaller arches, which are thrown over the aisles, at once assisting to support the roof, banding the whole fabric together, and giving it additional strength. When these arches occur, the pillars are exchanged for compound piers, one shaft of which is carried up to meet the arch above."

At San Zeno, Verona (a Romanesque edifice, begun in 1138, and finished in 1175), every alternate pier is a massive collection of shafts, with arches crossing the aisles and nave, as in the above instances. So striking indeed is the resemblance in these buildings to many of our own Norman churches, where we find shafts carried up with no reference to the present roofs, and yet well adapted to the support of such gables as I have been describing, that there seems good reason to conclude, that such features were at one time very general in this country, as well as abroad, and the question addresses itself to the attention of those entrusted with the restoration of our more ancient churches.

Previous to the date of the Westminster roof, timber arches had been applied in a form consonant to the general characteristics of their date, as at Nursted Court, near Gravesend, and other places; and whether the hall of Rufus was entirely covered by wooden framing, or had stone supports, the construction in wood of such a gable as we have been considering, was the task proposed to himself, and, in my humble opinion, nobly performed, by the architect of Richard the Second. Of those indeed who, to prove the falsity of its principle, refer to the distortion it has sustained in four centuries and a half, it may be fairly inquired, whether the many failures in masonry warrant the denial of truth in the theory of the arch altogether. The term "foliated" has been ably advocated, as applicable to the later wooden roofs, but in examples antecedent to the introduction of foliations as a common architectural feature, the roofs were, of course, without that characteristic, and in modern works where cusps are excluded, as in lancet buildings, they are, I presume, still generally and properly omitted. Such unfoliated roofs "possess," it has been said, "the merit of giving a grand and church-like, though simple effect, without doing violence to the genius of its material." They certainly embody, in an eminent degree, the principle of rendering elegant the essential constructive elements, and of avoiding adventitious parts for ornament alone.

In concluding these remarks, I will advert for a moment only to the unfairness and futility of instituting comparisons between open wooden roofs and stone groinings, unless they were equally suited to our means, and depended for adoption entirely on choice. I am far from insensible to the charm of "the fretted vault," but where is an example as capacious as Westminster Hall, doubling, as it does, the breadth of our widest cathedral nave? When wood, applied to the purpose of groining, is painted, and made to represent stone, a deception is clearly practised; but, regarding the arched ramifications of a natural grove as a type

followed in ribbed vaultings, there would seem little impropriety in representing the "fair branches and shadowy abroad" of the cedar fairly and ostensibly in timber. The subterfuges witnessed in the wooden groining over parts of St. Alban's Abbey, York Minster, and other buildings, are, doubtless, owing to the ponderosity of stone. The sacrifice of internal height which many of our finest edifices have sustained from the introduction of stone groining (and which would be quite destructive of effect in buildings of wide proportion), lays them open to the severe remark upon the splendid outer dome of St. Paul's, of being "a mere imposing show, constructed at a vast expense, without any legitimate reason;" for it need not be mentioned, that the groined ceiling never supersedes the ordinary roof, and between the two there often exists a chamber of considerable height, not only for the purpose of increasing the weight of the walls, and their ability to resist the thrust of the groins, but also to admit of building the latter under cover. The cost of the centring alone for a stone ceiling would, probably, pay for the decoration of an open roof, and the value of fair groining, if taken at 50*l.* a square, which experience enables me to state as a proximate sum, would place it quite beyond general application. While economy therefore confines us almost exclusively to the open form of roof, it is gratifying to experience the conviction, that it is truthful in principle, and, when artistically treated, capable of displaying, in the fullest and most graceful manner, the entire capacity of the buildings it covers.

THOMAS MORRIS.

In the discussion which followed, Mr. C. H. Smith stated that upon a close inspection of this roof, he had ascertained that the foot of the arch-rib did not rest upon the projecting portion of the moulded stone corbel, but that an actual space existed between them; and he had been informed by a competent authority that this is the case with many similar roofs.

Mr. Fowler (in the chair) said that he also had an opportunity of closely inspecting the construction of the roof of Westminster Hall, at the time of the erection of the lantern, and of the general repair some thirty years ago, and he had observed the expedients adopted to secure the roof, by means of bolts and ties, which compensated for the decay of the pine and tenons of the framing, but were not required from any defect in the principles of the construction. Mr. Smith's observations respecting the corbels did not, in his opinion, tend to disprove the theory advanced by Mr. Morris, but rather showed the prudence of those who constructed the roof: it would certainly have been very injudicious to allow the feet of the ribs to impinge upon the extreme ends of the corbels, weakened, as they

were, to some extent, by the mouldings. The ribs were, doubtless, continued into the solid of the wall.

#### THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE AND ART.

THE charities of the metropolis, the Art-Union of London, and many other bodies associated for useful purposes, have sustained a great loss by the death of H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge. The council of the Art-Union, on Tuesday, when the announcement of his death was made to them, adjourned the meeting, in token of respect and sorrow. The following anecdote of the Duke, illustrative simply of his Royal Highness's manner, will probably not be considered out of place at this moment. Very early in the morning of the first day after the private view of the British Institution Exhibition in 1849, Mr. Godwin was alone in the Gallery, when the Duke of Cambridge entered with one of his suite. The Duke kindly recognized him, and spoke as to two or three of the pictures. Ultimately the Duke came to a very dark painting by Danby, which some of our readers will recollect, called "A Highland Chieftain's Funeral." "That's a bad picture," said the Duke. "Well, sir," replied his auditor, "I am sorry to differ from you, but I don't think it a bad picture." "You don't think it a bad picture? Now, I insist on your telling me why it isn't a bad picture." "Why, sir, if you'll permit me, it is so and so, and so and so; and, moreover, it is very poetical." "Poetical, is it?" rejoined the Duke, with a dry laugh; "ah! yes, poetical; that means you must have it in you yourself, and I haven't."

#### CHURCH BUILDING NEWS.

St. John the Evangelist, Whitby, was consecrated on 2nd instant. The foundation-stone was laid on 12th October, 1848. The edifice is in the Early English style, and 70 feet long by 45 feet wide internally. The plan approaches the cruciform, having transepts of slight projection at the sides. The south transept, with its entrance, middle story, and round window, is crowned with a bell spire between the side pinnacles, altogether the loftiest part of the building. A "five lancet window" fills the space over the western entrance to the gable, which terminates with a cross. The side windows are the "lancet in two," between buttresses hooded and finialled. There are pinnacled buttresses at the angles of the side aisles and on the west front. The interior is divided by pointed arches into aisles, and galleried the whole length and across the west end. The recess formed by the north transept

